

MINUTES ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL

Greenville, NC
March 9, 2006

The Greenville City Council met in a regular meeting on the above date at 7:00 PM in the City Council Chambers, third floor of the Municipal Building, with Mayor Robert D. Parrott presiding. The meeting was called to order, followed by the invocation by Council Member Dunn and the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The following were present.

Mayor Robert D. Parrott
Mayor Pro-Tem Mildred A. Council
Council Member Ray Craft
Council Member Pat Dunn
Council Member Rose H. Glover
Council Member Chip Little
Council Member Larry Spell
Wayne Bowers, City Manager
Wanda T. Elks, City Clerk
Dave Holec, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

City Manager Bowers requested continuance of the public hearing and second reading of an ordinance for a taxicab franchise for Richard Barnes, addition of a budget ordinance amendment for Greenville Utilities, addition of a closed session for the acquisition of real property, and the movement of the item regarding the property on Moye Boulevard near Guy Smith Stadium to after the closed session.

Motion was made by Council Member Glover and seconded by Council Member Little to approve the agenda as presented, with the amendments cited by the City Manager. Motion carried unanimously.

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

Mr. Charles Sumerlin was presented with a plaque upon his retirement with 17 years of service in the Public Works Department.

Mayor Parrott recognized and congratulated the J. H. Rose High School Football coach, Greg Thomas, for winning three straight North Carolina High School Athletic Association Class 4-A State championships. Coach Thomas was presented with certificates for individual team members from the City of Greenville.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Citizens Advisory Commission on Cable Television

Motion was made by Council Member Spell seconded by Council Member Dunn to appoint Norwood Bradshaw to fill an unexpired term that expires March 2007, replacing Esmeralda Cabello-Black, who resigned, to appoint Heather Cwiakala to fill an unexpired term that expires March 2007, replacing Andy Miller, who resigned; to appoint Mike Godwin for a first term expiring March 2009, replacing Elaine Paul; and to reappoint Tonya Armwood for a second term, expiring March 2009; and to reappoint Tim Hudson for a first term expiring March 2006. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was later made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Council Member Little to reappoint James Rees for a second term, expiring March 2009. Motion carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE REZONING WILLIAM H. AND EDNA K. BROWN PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF CHARLES BOULEVARD AND WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF CHARLES BOULEVARD AND HERMAN GARRIS ROAD, FROM RA20 TO R6 AND R6A - ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27 and March 6, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by Bill Clark Homes of Greenville, LLC to rezone the William H. and Edna K. Brown property containing 52.8541 acres located south of the right-of-way of Charles Boulevard and 2,160± feet west of the intersection of Charles Boulevard and Herman Garriss Road, from RA20 to R6 and R6A. The Planning and Zoning Commission, at its February 21, 2006 meeting, voted to recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Harry Hamilton, Chief Planner, delineated the property on a map and explained that this request is to rezone approximately 53 acres from RA-20 to R-6 and R-6A. Tract 1 is approximately 29 acres and Tract 2 is approximately 23 acres. The requested zoning on Tract 1 is R-6 and Tract 2 is R-6A. The property is currently used for agricultural uses and a large portion of the property is wooded. The property is not impacted by the floodplain. Charles Boulevard is considered a gateway corridor, and there is a regional focus area to the west at Fire Tower Road and a small neighborhood focus area. Charles Boulevard is considered a major thoroughfare. The proposed rezoning could generate an increase of 1500 trips with 1100 trips to the west and 400 trips to the east of the subject site. The Land Use Plan recommends Office/Institutional/Multi-Family to the south of Charles Boulevard that transitions into medium density residential. To the east and west of the subject property is OR and R-6 and R-6A zoning. These properties were zoned in a similar fashion to this request in 2000 and 2002. Staff anticipates that the rezoning on Tract 1 could generate 370 two and three-bedroom multi-family units and Tract 2 could generate 168 two and three-bedroom units. At the current zoning, staff anticipates approximately 209 single-family units on the entire tract. In staff's opinion, the request is in compliance with the Horizons Plan and the Land Use Plan.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Dunn and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance rezoning 52.8541 acres located south of the right-of-way of Charles Boulevard and 2,160± feet west of the intersection of Charles Boulevard and Herman Garris Road, from RA20 to R6 and R6A. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-26)

ORDINANCE REZONING HARRELL PASCASIO AND WIND AND SEA, LLC, PROPERTY LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF DICKINSON AVENUE AND THE WESTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF WEST EIGHTH STREET, NORTH OF FICKLEN STREET AND WEST OF SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET, FROM CDF TO CD - ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27 and March 6, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by Harrell Pascasio and Wind and Sea, LLC to rezone 1.49 acres located along the southern right-of-way of Dickinson Avenue and the western right-of-way of West Eighth Street, 135± feet north of Ficklen Street, and 225± feet west of South Washington Street, from CDF to CD. The Planning and Zoning Commission, at its February 21, 2006 meeting, voted to recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Hamilton delineated the property on a map and explained that this request involves three lots that total 1.5 acres. The property is not impacted by the floodplain. Dickinson Avenue, Tenth Street, Reade Circle and Evans Street are considered connector corridors and major thoroughfares. The downtown core area is considered a regional focus area. Due to the small size of the tracts, no traffic report was generated. The Land Use Plan Map recommends commercial for the area bounded by Reade Circle, Dickinson Avenue, Evans Street and Tenth Street. The property is currently zoned CDF. Over the past years, there have been similar rezoning requests for downtown commercial in this area. Both districts permit commercial and multi-family development within them; however, within the CD district there are zero lot lines and relaxed parking requirements. In staff's opinion, this request is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance rezoning 1.49 acres located along the southern right-of-way of Dickinson Avenue and the western right-of-way of West Eighth Street, 135± feet north of Ficklen Street, and 225± feet west of South Washington Street, from CDF to CD. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-27)

ORDINANCE REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF WHICHARD ROAD, NORTH US HIGHWAY 264 EAST, AND EAST OF GREENVILLE BOULEVARD FROM GC TO OR - ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27 and March 6, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by A. Scott Buck (State of North Carolina) to rezone 128.4 acres located

along the southern right-of-way of Whichard Road, north of US Highway 264 East, and 1,400± feet east of Greenville Boulevard from GC to OR. The Planning and Zoning Commission, at its February 21, 2006 meeting, voted to recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Hamilton delineated the property on a map and explained that the property is currently within the County's jurisdiction and is zoned General Commercial. The applicant has applied for voluntary annexation, which necessitates that the property be rezoned. The property is located just to the north of US Highway 264 East and is currently vacant. To the west of the subject site, there is an approved site plan for the North Campus Crossing development for 600 units. The property is currently impacted by the 100-year floodplain and some 500-year floodplain. There is floodway on this property and no development can be placed within it. US Highway 264 East is considered a gateway corridor. Greenville Boulevard is considered a connector corridor and Whichard Road is a residential corridor. There is a regional focus area located to the south. Both Greenville Boulevard and US Highway 264 East are considered major thoroughfares. The proposed rezoning could result in a decrease of 1,000 trips per day with those broken out with 200 trips to the west and 100 trips to the east along Whichard Road and 400 trips to the west and 300 trips to the east along US Highway 264. The multi-family duplex layer indicates the location of North Campus Crossing with an approved site plan for 600 units. The Land Use Plan Map recommends Office/Institutional/Multi-Family that transitions into low-density residential. The property is currently within the County's jurisdiction and zoned General Commercial. The proposed zoning is OR. Since the property is owned by the State of North Carolina, the property could be used for the expansion of the ECU campus. If the property were to be developed under the OR standards, it could result in approximately 1500 multi-family units. This request is in compliance with the Horizons Plan and Land Use Plan.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience.

Mr. Jim Walker, representing the petitioner, informed the Council that the intramural fields for this sight have been designed. There will be no buildings other than those to support the intramural sports, such as dugouts and locker rooms.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the ordinance to rezoning 128.4 acres located along the southern right-of-way of Whichard Road, north of US Highway 264 East, and 1,400± feet east of Greenville Boulevard from GC to OR. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-28)

ORDINANCE ANNEXING STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA PROPERTY, LOCATED SOUTH OF WHICHARD ROAD AND NORTH OF US HIGHWAY 264 – ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by the State of North Carolina to annex 128.4 acres, located south of Whichard Road and north of US Highway 264. This is a non-contiguous annexation.

Mr. Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development, delineated the property on a map and stated that the property is located in Voting District 1. The property is currently vacant and the proposed use is for East Carolina University facilities. The current population is 0, and the anticipated population at full development is 0.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to adopt the ordinance annexing 128.4 acres, located south of Whichard Road and north of US Highway 264. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-29)

ORDINANCE ANNEXING LAUREL RIDGE, SECTION ONE, LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF ALLEN ROAD, SOUTH OF TEAKWOOD SUBDIVISION - ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider annexing Laurel Ridge, Section One, involving 9.303 acres located on the west side of Allen Road, south of Teakwood Subdivision. This is a non-contiguous annexation.

Mr. Flood delineated the property on a map and stated that the property is located in Voting District 1. The property is currently vacant and the proposed use is for 40,000 square feet of total office development on 8 lots shown on the approved preliminary plat of Laurel Park Subdivision. The current population is 0, and the anticipated population at full development is 0.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance annexing Laurel Ridge, Section 1, involving 9.303 acres located on the west side of Allen Road, south of Teakwood Subdivision. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-30)

ORDINANCE ANNEXING COBBLESTONE, PHASE THREE, LOCATED EAST OF ALLEN ROAD AND ADJACENT TO THE EAST SIDE OF COBBLESTONE, PHASE 2 - ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider annexing Cobblestone, Phase Three, located east of Allen Road and adjacent to the east side of Cobblestone, Phase 2. This is a non-contiguous annexation.

Mr. Flood delineated the property on a map and stated that the property is located in Voting District 1. The property is currently vacant and the proposed use is for 46 duplexes (92 units). The current population is 0, and the anticipated population at full development is 225, with 142 being minority.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Little to adopt the ordinance annexing Cobblestone, Phase Three, located east of Allen Road and adjacent to the east side of Cobblestone, Phase 2. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-31)

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT TO AMEND THE ZONING REGULATIONS TO INCLUDE A NEW DEFINITION ENTITLED "PORTABLE TEMPORARY STORAGE UNIT" AND TO INCLUDE MINIMUM STANDARDS CONCERNING THE LOCATION, DURATION, FREQUENCY, NUMBER AND USE OF UNITS ON BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND NONRESIDENTIAL LOTS - ADOPTED

City Manager Wayne Bowers reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on February 27 and March 6, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by the Community Development Department to amend the Zoning Regulations to include a new definition entitled "portable temporary storage unit" and to include minimum standards concerning the location, duration, frequency, number and use units on both residential and nonresidential lots.

Mr. Hamilton stated that currently all storage units are regulated either as a vehicle or as a permanent accessory structure. Vehicles used for storage purposes, including both trucks and licensed trailers, have routinely been employed for both residential and nonresidential temporary storage. Examples of vehicle type storage include panel trucks for storage and transport of personal household items, towed trailers for storage or transport of construction materials and tractor-trailers for warehousing of commercial stock-in-trade. Such vehicles are, and will continue to be, subject to the parking standards including the improved parking surface requirement (i.e. no parking on the grass) and the traffic laws related to street parking. Permanent accessory structures are regulated by the zoning regulations and are subject to minimum building construction and setback standards. The continued use of shipping containers as temporary or permanent accessory storage for office, institutional, commercial and industrial businesses is permitted under the current and proposed ordinance, provided compliance with existing zoning requirements including setback, parking and bufferyard standards. No permanent or temporary accessory structure may be located in the front or side yard area of any dwelling; therefore, placement of an accessory structure on a front or side yard driveway is not permitted. Presently there are no standards for temporary storage units not covered in the preceding categories. The current building and parking regulations do not specifically cover the use of a storage unit that is transported to a job site or residence and subsequently removed from a support chase or truck bed, such as a "PODS" type unit. The ordinance will define and regulate all portable temporary storage units including both vehicle storage units and "PODS" type units. Regulation of portable temporary storage units is supported by the goals, policies and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan specifically that the regulation of portable temporary storage units will promote neighborhood livability by insuring a safe and aesthetic residential environment, and in addition will promote safe, efficient and aesthetic nonresidential developments. A survey of several NC cities concerning the use of portable temporary storage units was conducted. Raleigh has no specific language in their ordinance that addresses POD

type units. They do, however, restrict them to driveways only. Location over 30 days triggers inspection and request for removal. They do allow PODS to remain longer if they are being used in association with building renovations. The City of Charlotte does not have any specific language in their ordinance to address POD type units. They treat them as accessory uses which are required to meet the same setbacks as any accessory storage structure. Their ordinance defines temporary as no longer than 90 days. Wilmington has no specific requirements for residential use and it is not addressed in the Code. It addresses containers for commercial purposes only. Jacksonville has no specific requirements. In Gastonia, the PODS must comply with all provisions related to placement, setbacks and signage applicable to a permanent structure. In Conover, portable containers are permitted in association with construction activities for a period of six months. It may be extended for an additional six-month period if necessary for completion of construction. In Pinehurst, portable containers are treated as accessory structures and must comply with setbacks and design standards. In Rocky Mount, there are no specific requirements, and they are not addressed in the Code.

Upon being asked if these regulations included trailers, Mr. Hamilton replied that if they are in the rear yard, generally they are not a problem.

It was suggested by Council Member Little that the regulations should state that it is for rental units.

Mr. Hamilton stated that side and rear setbacks apply. These regulations do not affect commercial businesses using these permanently in the backyard if they meet the setbacks. The Planning and Zoning Commission chose to not require a sketch plan.

Council Member Glover stated that there should also be a regulation for port-a-potties.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience.

Mr. Bill Burnette, President of Portable on Demand Storage (PODS), stated that PODS started in Clear Water, Florida approximately seven years ago, and the company now has over 120 franchises throughout the entire United States. PODS has been working with the Planning and Zoning Commission to prepare an ordinance that will work for Greenville. The proposed ordinance will be the most restrictive ordinance in the Mid-Atlantic region and the third most restrictive ordinance in the entire country. The proposed ordinance allows only 45 days to have a storage unit on-site. PODS requested that the storage units be allowed on-site for at least six months. Mr. Burnette informed the City Council that the City of Wilmington recently passed an ordinance that would allow storage units on-site for up to 6 months. Mr. Burnette stated that Portable on Demand Storage regulates itself and units are rented and not sold, which eliminates units becoming permanent structures. Over 3,000 citizens have been serviced in the Greenville area with only 12 reported complaints in two years. Another concern with the proposed ordinance was not allowing storage units on the streets. Certain homes inside the City of Greenville do not possess driveways, causing citizen to place the storage unit on the street in order to move their belongings. Also, the proposed ordinance only allows two containers to be placed at a residence at one time. Most customers that utilize portable on demand storage units use three storage units to move. An average container holds approximately 1,000 square feet, and this restriction will only make the customers' move more painful. Mr. Burnette asked the

City Council to deny the ordinance and allow Portable on Demand Storage to continue to be self-regulating.

Concerns expressed and questions/answers given during this period include:

- Does it normally take someone 6 months to move?
(RESPONSE: No, the average move is within 30 days, because customers can pack and move at their own pace. The average rental is about 90 days.)
- Portable on Demand Storage does a good job of regulating their units, but how about others businesses that could also have these types of units that are either built or acquired from someone else?
(RESPONSE: That would be difficult because Portable on Demand Storage is a patented lift system as well as the box. People cannot go out and recreate the PODS container or recreate the lift system.)
- It was stated that Portable on Demand Storage has served over 3,000 customers in the area over the last two years. What would be the longest time that a unit was rented to one location?
(RESPONSE: About 6 months.)
- Of the 3,000 served, were these private homes in residential neighborhoods or rentals to businesses?
(RESPONSE: Yes, some customers have been businesses. Many local businesses utilize Portable on Department Storage services to hold additional inventory during the holidays.)
- Do the containers tend to stay six months in neighborhoods or six months in commercial areas?
(RESPONSE: The average stay is approximately 90 days, but it varies.)

City Manager Bowers informed the City Council that he had been involved in a complaint alleging that a container had been in a residential area for nine months. There was a concern from the neighborhood association that the resident's intent was to keep the unit in place permanently because of a comment made that the POD was cheaper than a mini-storage unit and more convenient. This is one of the reasons staff is recommending the proposed ordinance, for people who want to keep the containers for longer periods of time. The ordinance was put together to prevent the permanent location of containers in residential neighborhoods. The majority of residents probably would not agree with neighbors using a POD as a mini-storage facility.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Little stated that the Council should review Wilmington's new policy. He questioned why the City would create a new ordinance if there have only been 12 to 20 complaints out of 65,000 people in the City. The company appears to be self-regulating itself well and as far as permanency, the containers cannot stay in place forever.

Upon being asked if he would have a problem with a container sitting in a driveway next to his house, Council Member Little replied that he would have a problem if the container were a permanent fixture. Upon being asked how he would feel about having the POD located there for six months, Council Member Little replied that he did not think it would bother him if the container were utilized for moving or storing. There will always be people in this town that do not like the way someone is storing their camping equipment or boats in their yards and in their driveways. Some power and responsibility needs to be given to the neighborhood associations.

Mr. Hamilton stated that staff contacted Wilmington directly in December regarding PODS, and staff was specifically told that Wilmington had no specific requirements for residential use and was not addressed in the Wilmington Code. The person that staff spoke with did not refer to an ordinance that dealt with PODS on residential lots. Wilmington may very well have an ordinance and staff will check into that. Mr. Hamilton stated that the packets given to Council earlier contained the results of surveys when staff contacted cities directly.

Council Member Dunn stated that she did not think the number of complaints was pertinent, because residents do not always know to call the City with complaints. She expressed that six months is a long period of time.

Council Member Spell stated that he thought it was important for City Council to get in front of the PODS issue before there were more than 12 complaints. Council Member Spell further stated that there was a distinction between a storage unit and someone's boat, camper or trailer.

Council Member Glover stated that Greenville is a transient city with people moving in and out all the time and that 45 days or 90 days was a short time and six months was not too long. Renovating a home can sometimes take almost a year. The City is not having a problem and putting such a stringent restriction on storage units would be moving too fast. Six months would be a good time frame and staff can keep up with the proven complaints. Then Council could revisit the issue again if there are many complaints.

Upon being asked if a building permit would allow for a storage unit to be left in a yard, Mr. Hamilton replied that if the permit is for original construction or for damage repair the storage unit could be kept on the premises as long as needed. There is a restriction if the permit is for single-family or duplex and if the permit does not fall under the two categories--original construction or damage repair-- the time period is limited to six months.

Mr. Hamilton stated that a storage unit can be dropped off at someone's home, loaded and then transported by PODS to a storage facility used for long term storage and can be brought back to a residence at any time for unloading. The exemption of the 14 days would give someone 14 days to load and unload a unit prior to the transportation back to the Portable on Demand Storage facility.

Mayor Parrott stated that he has moved four times within the City and it took no more than a week to move.

Council Member Craft stated that he thought the ordinance contained a lot of restrictions about temporary storage units.

Council Member Spell stated that it was important that businesses' practices not be a burden or have an adverse effect on neighborhoods.

Council Member Craft responded that he did not think that a burden had been shown yet.

Council Member Spell stated that he thought 45 days would be sufficient and that a unit sitting in someone's driveway for 6 months could have a negative effect on the appearance of a neighborhood.

Council Member Dunn stated that there were a variety of issues to be considered and that Council should be able to arrive at some kind of compromise. If the Portable on Demand Storage business is really flourishing then the City will be seeing more of the units and not less. A lot of the storage business is with commercial property and the proposed ordinance would not apply. Also, building permits allow storage containers to remain on property until the building is completed. If there is some type of tragedy such as a flood, exceptions could be made.

Upon being asked if there were any comments on the length of time for a storage unit to remain at a residence, Mr. Hamilton replied there are two different lengths of time--total days per year and days in a continuous period. Presently, the length of time is 45 days in one continuous period, and 60 total days within 12 months. Both lengths of time would need to be adjusted. Because the City does not require a permit, it will be very difficult to enforce how long a unit has been on a site. Also, with an unlimited number of frequencies it will be very difficult to follow.

Motion was made by Council Member Dunn and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance with the provision that a portable on demand storage unit be allowed to be located for either 120 days continuously and no greater than 120 days within a 12 month period and with only two separate periods. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-25)

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE WEST GREENVILLE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPROVED

City Manager Bowers stated notice of public hearing was advertised in The Daily Reflector on February 20 and 27, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request from the Greenville Redevelopment Commission to approve the West Greenville Redevelopment Plan as contained within the document titled "The Center City - West Greenville Revitalization Plan".

Mr. Carl Rees, Senior Planner, stated the Redevelopment Commission hired the consultant for the West Greenville Redevelopment Plan in November 2003. The first public meeting to receive input was held in February 2004. In November 2004, there was an open house at the Eppes Center to present the draft plan. The Redevelopment Commission held a public hearing in March 2005, and more work done on the plan. The Planning and Zoning Commission held the public hearing in June 2005 and another in October 2005. In November 2005, the Plan was presented to the West Greenville community at Mt. Calvary Free Will Baptist Church. In December 2005, the Redevelopment Commission delayed the vote on the Plan. On January 2006, the Redevelopment Commission adopted the Plan, which incorporated comments by the West Greenville Focus Group. The public hearing is scheduled for tonight.

Mrs. Minnie Anderson, Chairman of the Redevelopment Commission, stated that the Redevelopment Commission had a mission to work on the Revitalization plan that included removing blight, such as substandard housing and inadequate public infrastructure. The Commission was to work on the creation of opportunities for economic development including quality of affordable housing, improving streets and traffic flow and great locations where businesses could prosper and thus create jobs, while at the same time saving, restoring and reusing historic structures where possible. Regardless of what has been said, the Commission has not eliminated any African Americans from West Greenville and there are no plans to do so. The revitalization program is about improving, not removing. The City is on its way to having homes that owners will take care of and be proud of for many years to come. There will be businesses on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and people will be able to walk and share in the community in the spirit that is already there. In the process of bringing about a new West Greenville, the community will bring pride and keep the legacy of those that live there and have died there. The Commission looks forward to the growth and having the older historic homes brought back to their original splendor. Ms. Anderson asked the City Council to consider the plan making West Greenville a place everyone will be proud to call home. Ms. Anderson thanked the Council for their input and ideas to improve and revitalize while preserving the unique characteristics of West Greenville.

Mayor Parrott thanked Ms. Anderson for being a public servant to the community and for all the many hours of hard work that she put in for the plan. What Ms. Anderson has done will move the community forward over the next 20 to 30 years.

Mayor Parrott opened the public hearing for comments.

Mr. Ozzie Hall, a member of the West Greenville Focus Group, thanked the members of the West Greenville Focus Group for the many hours they put into making a plan that was acceptable to the community. Mr. Hall also thanked Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development, the City Manager and others who were involved in working to negotiate and make a plan that was acceptable and workable. The West Greenville Focus Group was asked by Council Member Glover to look at the Redevelopment Plan and to advise her on how to vote. The group was appalled when they read the Plan, because it called for R6S zoning, which would essentially remove all black owned businesses from West Greenville except for one business on Albemarle Avenue. The Plan would also have displaced a massive number of black residents and destroyed the heart of the black political district, and the plan would also have created a provision that could have allowed the homes on Farmville Boulevard to be taken ahead of the Department of Transportation's plan for the 10th Street Connector. There were a number of things that were very offensive to the people in the community in this plan. When the Focus Group sat down with the Mayor, the City Manager and others and discussed the plan, there was an acknowledgement that there were some problems. After negotiating and working through the plan, it is not perfect, but it is a plan that is in the best interest of the community overall. The African American Community and everyone is encouraged to get involved in the redevelopment process. Mr. Hall encouraged the City Council to vote to approve the current Redevelopment Plan as presented.

Mayor Parrott thanked Mr. Hall and the West Greenville Focus Group for their many volunteer hours helping move the Redevelopment Plan forward.

There being no further comments the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Glover thanked the City Council for their vision to move ahead with the revitalization of West Greenville and thanked Mr. Flood and the Community Development staff, Mr. Rees and everyone that had a part in working with the City Council. Ms. Glover also thanked the West Greenville Focus Group, Minnie Anderson who served on the Redevelopment Commission, and Mr. Hall and Mr. Hemby who kept the community involved.

Mayor Pro-Tem Council agreed with Ms. Glover's comments and thanked the community for their involvement and stated that it will take a long-term commitment.

Mayor Parrott stated that the Redevelopment Plan could be the best thing that the City Council has done for the City. The Redevelopment Plan will improve the quality of life for a lot of citizens. There have been a lot of people involved in this endeavor and some whose names have not been mentioned. Mayor Parrott asked Ms. Anderson and Mr. Hall to take back to the Redevelopment Commission and the Focus Group the Council's thanks for all of their help.

Council Member Little stated that because of all the input that has been received from all the different community groups, the work that Mr. Hall, the Focus Group, Mr. Flood and his staff and Ms. Anderson and her group did and all the countless meetings, he thought that the City now had a plan that is going to be workable and will lead the City into the future.

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the Redevelopment Plan. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 06-06, Document No. 06-3)

Mayor Pro-Tem Council and Council Member Glover thanked the City Council for having a vision of moving ahead in West Greenville. She thanked Mr. Flood, the Development Department, and everyone else who had a part of re-writing the West Greenville Redevelopment Plan. She also thanked the West Greenville Focus Group and Minnie Anderson.

SECOND READING OF AN ORDINANCE FOR A TAXICAB FRANCHISE FOR STEVEN SMITH, D/B/A GREENVILLE'S TAXI - ADOPTED

City Attorney Dave Holec stated that notice of public hearing was advertised in The Daily Reflector on February 27, 2006 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing and second reading of an ordinance establishing a limousine franchise for Steven Smith, d/b/a Greenville's Taxi. The first reading of the ordinance was on March 6, 2006. Notices were mailed to all taxicab and limousine franchisees. Staff recommends denial of the request.

Mr. Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney, presented the Council with information regarding the lack of financial stability of the applicant, the failure of the applicant to prove that another taxicab franchise is needed, and the lack of experience of operating a business. He suggested that the options of the Council are to approve, disapprove or approve with the condition that the applicant pay six months of his insurance up front.

After discussion about giving the applicant a chance, Mr. Little stated that the conditions are required by ordinance by anybody who received a taxicab franchise, as they are set by statute.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience.

Mr. Steven Smith stated that people don't normally pay six months of insurance at a time, as the cost is \$450 per month. He explained how of the fifty taxis operating, 35% of the slots are for six companies. He has worked for 1/2 of the companies. He wants to offer a new face to the community. Each time he changed jobs, it was a step-up. He is a positive person and wishes to offer a good Christian taxicab service.

Council Member Little stated that he admired the applicant and didn't know who someone can say there are enough taxicabs. Unless there is a formula, just saying 50 percent of the cabs are not in operation doesn't really say anything. The only concern he has is the insurance issue.

Mayor Pro-Tem Council stated that she admires any young person that is trying to get ahead. She asked that the Council give him an opportunity to do what he wants to do. She congratulated him for trying.

Mr. Willie Wilson stated that if he wanted to go into business, he should be given the opportunity to sink or swim.

Council Member Dunn stated that she supports the efforts of anybody to get their private business. The issue she sees is whether the City Council can ensure that the citizens are safe. If the Council grants the license, what is it that it is assuring to the public? It needs to be assured of the insurance piece not only for the citizens riding in the vehicles, but also for the person in the business.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to approve on second reading the ordinance granting a taxicab franchise to Steven Smith, d/b/a Greenville's Taxi. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 06-25)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Barbara Turner informed the City Council that her son, Kerry Turner, was shot and killed by the Greenville police on January 26, 2006. Ms. Turner requested to read the following letter written by Mr. Harry Wilson. The letter expresses the feelings of Kerry Turner's family and many in the community regarding the events resulting in Kerry Turner's death. The letter is as follows:

“COPY”

“Yesterday a mentally disturbed deranged young man was truly murdered by our police. All of my adult life, many years, I have been a strong supporter of law and order and still am. What happened wasn't law or order. No amount of investigating can whitewash this tragedy. Why

send uniformed uninformed police officers that know nothing about bi-polar or schizophrenia in police cars to apprehend a mental case. When Mr. Turner bolted and fled to his car, he was shot at and chased at dangerous speeds with several police cars down congested streets, and endangering the lives of innocent people. Can one imagine how a mental case would react after being shot at? Why not maintain a safe distance behind him. He could not go on forever. In all probability, there would have been no damaged vehicles and a mother's son would still be alive. Why not contact police headquarters for advice. I feel that our Chief would have advised a different procedure. This man's past arrest record or offenses could never justify the outcome. The fact that he was thought to have a 22-caliber rifle was no justification for three officers opening fire on him unless he exited his vehicle with weapon in hand and pointed. I truly hope the shooters can rationalize and justify their actions. This can be hard to live with."

"COPY"

Ms. Turner informed the City Council that her cell phone was taken from her by the police while she was talking to her son, and the Police Chief was standing next to her car and would not let her and her husband get out of the car. Ms. Turner showed a picture of the windshield of their car. Mr. Turner stated that 15 bullets were shot over the steering wheel. Kerry Turner was shot multiple times in the head and multiple times in the chest. Mr. Turner further stated that he thought this tragedy had truly made Greenville look bad. One bullet could have killed Kerry Turner; he did not need 15 bullets.

Mr. Frank Schenck, a member of the Citizens Advisory Commission on Cable TV, expressed concerns that key House lawmakers had agreed to a principal to be awarded to a national cable franchise to phone companies and would subject cable operators to continue local franchising requirements until phone rivals had achieved 15% local video market penetration. Greenville will be losing the best cable company in the country in Cox. Mr. Schenck thanked the City Council for the DVD player for the GTV Channel and informed the Council that a downtown location was also needed as a headquarters.

Mr. Al Alston, President of Citizens for Justice, stated that the civil organization has been formed in Greenville and is willing to represent anyone in the City regardless of race, creed and color that have experienced civil rights violations. Mr. Alston further stated that he was present in support of the Turner family. The Citizens for Justice is led by Biblical principals, and the organization is here to bridge the racial lines of division that exist in Greenville and to act as liaisons between the local government, communities, the Greenville Police Department and the Pitt County School System. The Citizens for Justice asked the City Council to consider implementing the following recommendations, which would help better conditions for Greenville: (1) the City Council to consider implementing a Citizens Review Board for Police Officers, consisting of a diverse group of citizens who would have authority to take and hear complaints regarding police officers' unethical conduct. This group would have authority to advise, discipline, and see that the discipline is carried out, (2) the City Council to mandate that every police officer that responded and witnessed the killing of Kerry Turner obtain psychological assistance, and (3) the City Council to place the Chief of Police, Joseph Simonowich, on administrative leave with pay since he was at the scene and had full authority to command.

Mr. Carlos Murray, a Greenville native, retired trial lawyer, judge and college teacher, informed the City Council that he and his wife, Olivia, are very active in the National Lives for the Mentally Ill. Mr. Murray stated that his concern was for Mr. and Mrs. Turner who have lost their son. Mental illness affects almost every family in every community. Mr. Murray informed the Council that he and his wife got involved because of his wife's older son, and they are committed to helping the least cared about segment of our population. Most of the mentally ill with proper medication and other treatments can be productive citizens.

Mrs. Jimmy Lee spoke positively about Kerry Turner and stated that he was her son's best friend. She was concerned that the cell phone was taken away from Ms. Turner while talking to her son and the number of times that Kerry Turner was shot.

Mr. Larry Haigler, member of the National Lives for the Mentally Ill, stated that he and Mr. Murray were the founding fathers of National Lives for the Mentally Ill in Greenville. Mr. Haigler further stated that on May 1, 2006, the National Lives for the Mentally would be sponsoring a forum on Walking with Mental Illness at the Willis Building. A psychiatrist and a family member will discuss what it is like to have a family member with mental illness. A productive citizen who has mental illness will speak and also a police officer from Cary who has gone through extensive training in "The Memphis Model" will also speak about experiences in dealing with people with mental illness. Mr. Haigler encouraged the City Council Members and everyone to come and learn what it is like to walk with mental illness.

Ms. Carolyn Melvin, Vice President for Citizens for Justice, stated that the newly formed organization is based on what is right and what is wrong, biblically and by the laws. The organization is interested in bridging the gap of racism in the community. Ms. Melvin informed the City Council that she was a former police officer and had subdued and arrested several people for over 10 years, and this was the first time that she had ever seen an incident to this extent.

Mr. Raymond Lewis explained that his brother had been arrested for a gun charge and was given 20 years in prison.

INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER FEASIBILITY STUDY - ACCEPTED

Mr. Tom Tysinger, Director of Public Works, stated that in August of 2005, the City Council awarded a contract to Martin/Alexiou/Bryson (MAB) to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of an Intermodal Transportation Center in Greenville. The contract was awarded in cooperation with the Greenville Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. Since then, Martin/Alexiou/Bryson have been working with a steering committee made up of representatives from the City of Greenville, Pitt County, East Carolina University and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Mr. Tysinger informed the City Council that they should have received an executive summary, a copy of the full report as well as a letter from the chair of the Public Transportation Parking Commission speaking in support of the project as well as Elvin Letchaway, General Manager for Carolina Trailways, who is also very interested in seeing the Transportation Center move forward in Greenville.

Mr. George Alexiou with Martin/Alexiou/Bryson informed the City Council that the Transportation Center is a facility where various transportation services can come together. The primary purpose of the Transportation Center is to allow users to move freely and more conveniently between the offered services making the facility more efficient and provide more options for the various uses. There are many examples of Transportation Centers in North Carolina such as Rocky Mount, Wilson, and Spartanburg that provide indoor areas for waiting, restrooms, vending machines for transit users and areas where buses and taxis can pull in and out.

Mr. Alexiou informed the City Council that the study process regarding a Transportation Center for Greenville was very important. Meetings were held with area transportation operators, the North Carolina Department of Transportation, both the rail division and the public transportation providers. Meetings were also held with the City's Community Development Department and others around the community. Two public meetings were also held with approximately 20 to 30 people attending each meeting. Based on studies, analysis and interviews it was acknowledged that the GREAT System is in need of a central facility to bring all the buses into. Trailways and East Carolina University are interested in running a service through the Transportation Center, which would allow students who come from other parts of North Carolina to catch a Trailways Bus and then catch a shuttle that the University would provide and get a safe and convenient ride to the campus. East Carolina University employees would also be able to catch a GREAT bus downtown and then jump on a University shuttle and get access to the campus. Pitt Area Transit System (PATS) and the Pirate Transit are also interested in seeing benefits and improvements in their efficiency if they can distribute some of their clients into other forms of transportation such as the GREAT System. Ultimately, one day intercity passenger rail could be part of this service. Other features that the facility could include would be waiting areas, ticket areas, opportunities to shared ticketing, a car rental office, and Great Bus and Trailways Bus services. Security is also important and many facilities elsewhere have a small police substation or some sort of security, which is very comforting to users. Cafes and restaurants will generally develop around the facility area. It would be great if the transit facility would not be just a stand-alone functional facility, but part of a redevelopment and part of the mixed use. The transit facility could fit in the City's Tobacco District and contribute and benefit from other development and become a real community asset.

Mr. Alexiou informed the Council that approximately 14,000 square feet would be needed for the facility and would allow for expansion. A site of two to five acres and a total capital cost of \$6 to \$8 million would cover the type of building that the City of Greenville would want. Eighty percent of the funding would come from the federal government and ten percent from the state. These are earmarks that are available and Greenville already has some funding to move on. This funding cannot be used for other transit services. The City either uses the money for a transportation facility or the money goes elsewhere. The City will be required to give a ten percent contribution and that could be land or some payment in kind. There is an ongoing operating cost and part of that would be offset by Trailways' lease payment. Also, if the City decided to have a cafe inside the facility then that would also generate another leasing space.

Mr. Tysinger informed the Council that there is \$500,000 earmarked to move the project to the next phase, which is general planning for the facility and a site selection. The year after that there is another earmark that has not yet been secured, but the North Carolina Department of

Transportation is attempting to get it and that would be \$1 million for actual land acquisition. Staff is requesting that City Council authorize staff the authority to go to the North Carolina Department of Transportation and begin working on the next phase. No money would be expended until staff comes back before Council with either contracts or municipal agreements.

Motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to accept the Intermodal Transportation Center Feasibility Study and direct City staff to work with North Carolina Department of Transportation to develop the next phase of this project. Motion carried unanimously. (Document No. 06-02)

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF A PARCEL OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 101 VANCE STREET - ADOPTED

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the resolution authorizing the disposal of a parcel of real property located at 101 Vance Street. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 06-07)

REQUEST TO ASK PITT COUNTY FOR AN EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION EXTENSION IN THE NC-11 NORTH CORRIDOR - APPROVED

Mr. Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development, informed the Council that as a result of a request by the Town of Bethel to the City of Greenville for extension of a sanitary sewer force main from the Town of Bethel to the Greenville Utilities Commission sewer treatment system, a memorandum of understanding and an interlocal agreement were entered into by the City of Greenville, Pitt County, Greenville Utilities Commission and the Town of Bethel. The documents were the basis for the extension of sanitary sewer along the NC 11 corridor north to Bethel. The documents also called for certain provisions related to land use controls, financial participation and engineering. These agreements contained a number of provisions. One significant provision provided for an extraterritorial jurisdiction extension by the City of Greenville two miles along the NC 11 North Corridor. Another significant provision of the agreements required the adoption of land use controls by Pitt County for the corridor. In accordance with the agreements, the proposed land use plan and zoning regulations to be adopted by the County also required approval by the City of Greenville. Upon adoption of appropriate land use controls for the corridor by the County and subsequent City approval of the land use plan and zoning, the City agreed to relinquish control of connections to sanitary sewer along the NC 11 corridor in those areas beyond the extended extraterritorial jurisdiction of Greenville. The County was also required to participate financially in the sewer extension costs by providing annual payments for the difference in sanitary sewer main sizing at a cost of \$20,000 annually for 20 years and a graduated payment for 1/3 of the cost of an Industrial Park Pump Station for 20 years. In the latter part of 1998, Pitt County appointed a nine-member NC 11 Corridor Planning Committee to develop a land use plan and zoning ordinance for the NC 11 corridor area consisting of four Pitt County Planning Board members, one member of the Pitt County Board of Commissioners, one member of the Greenville City Council, one member of the Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission, one representative from the Town of Bethel, and one representative of Greenville Utilities Commission. The committee membership was later expanded in the summer of 1999 to include two landowners within the study boundary. The Wooten Company, as consultants to the County, were contracted to develop the land use plan

and zoning ordinance for the planning area under the direction of the Planning Committee. After several amendments to the study area boundary and the subsequent drafting of a recommended land use plan by the Planning Committee, the Land Use Plan and proposed zoning ordinance were submitted to the Pitt County Planning Board for consideration in 2000. The Pitt County Planning Board recommended approval of the Land Use Plan and zoning ordinance to the Board of County Commissioners. The County Commissioners, however, did not adopt the proposed Land Use Plan and zoning ordinance as recommended. As a result, the City of Greenville did not endorse the plan as required by the original agreement.

In November 2003, the Pitt County Commissioners adopted countywide zoning, including zoning in the corridor planning area, and the Pitt County Policy for Municipal Extraterritorial Jurisdictions (revised 12/2003). With the adoption of countywide zoning, municipalities are prohibited from extraterritorial jurisdiction limit extensions, unless the Pitt County Board of Commissioners approves such extensions. In 2003, the City of Greenville began an update of the City of Greenville's Comprehensive Plan. The updated plan was approved by City Council in February 2004 and identified future land use for areas that are within Greenville's natural growth area, generally three miles from the current city limits. Therefore, it is the recommendation of City staff that an extraterritorial jurisdiction extension in the NC 11 corridor be considered to a location approximately 2.6 miles from the existing primary City limits. This would involve approximately 1,724 acres and is approximately 1/2 mile beyond the area called for in the original agreement. Staff feels that this is necessary for several reasons. First, the recommended extension area limits, located at Grindle Creek, is a natural physical boundary. Natural boundaries such as creeks, streams, and/or other drainage features are more clearly identifiable and make more logical boundaries for extraterritorial jurisdiction limits. Grindle Creek is a major natural drainage feature and is recognized by the County in its future land use plan as a desirable edge between anticipated urban and rural development patterns. Second, the City of Greenville, by statute, is allowed to extend the extraterritorial jurisdiction limit up to three miles based upon population and county approval. Third, natural growth in this area, facilitated by the availability of sanitary sewer, will result in development that will be subject to annexation to Greenville. Fourth, the ability to properly coordinate development in this gateway corridor, within the context of the City's land use plan and standards, is an important goal of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Flood concluded by stating that this proposed extraterritorial jurisdiction extension area is included within the city's comprehensive planning area, is within the three-mile limit allowed by State statute for such extraterritorial jurisdiction extension, is within the three mile limit allowed by state statute for satellite annexation to the City (a prerequisite to sanitary sewer service), is contiguous to a designated gateway corridor that should be "carefully designed and developed" to reflect its important as an entranceway to the City, is demarcated by an identifiable geographical/topological boundary (Grindle Creek canal and floodplain) recognizable to the public, is to a point recognized by the County as the desirable edge between urban and rural development patterns, and the subject area, due to availability of sanitary sewer service and application annexation requirements, will be annexed to the City by voluntary petition at the time of sewer dependent development. Staff recommends, based on those factors, a Qualification Report for the Extension of the City of Greenville's extraterritorial planning jurisdiction in the NC 11 North Corridor be prepared and be submitted to Pitt County. If approved, the County would grant to the City of Greenville the permission to extend the extraterritorial jurisdiction in

this area. The additional process of property owner notification and public hearing for the purpose of extraterritorial jurisdiction extension by the City of Greenville would begin following the grant of the extension by Pitt County.

Motion was made by Council Member Dunn and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to approve the request to ask Pitt County for an extraterritorial jurisdiction extension in the NC-11 North Corridor. Motion carried unanimously.

CONTRACT AWARD FOR OAKDALE PARK - SITE AND UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT – APPROVED

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Dunn to award a contract for the Oakdale Park - Site and Utility Improvements Project to Carolina Earth Movers, Inc. in the amount of \$110,250 and approve the project budget. Motion carried unanimously. (Contract No. 1500)

CONTRACT AWARD FOR PREPARATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE SITE ASSESSMENT FOR RIVER PARK NORTH - APPROVED

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Dunn to award a contract for the preparation of a Comprehensive Site Assessment for River Park North to Fuss and O'Neill, Inc. in the amount of \$29,264.00. Motion carried unanimously. (Contract No. 1501)

LEASE RENEWAL WITH WEST GREENVILLE REGIONAL RESOURCES, INC., FOR A PORTION OF THE C.M. EPPES RECREATION CENTER - APPROVED

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Glover to approve the lease renewal with West Greenville Regional Resources, Inc., for a portion of the C.M. Eppes Recreation Center. Motion carried unanimously. (Contract No. 1244C)

CITY OF GREENVILLE 2006-2007 GOALS - ADOPTED

City Manager Bowers informed the Council that objectives and action items have been established for the 2006-2007 goals that were established by the Council at the January 28, 2006 Planning Session.

1. Goal: Form Effective Partnerships

A. *Objective: Encourage cooperation and coordination among units of local government in Pitt County*

Action Item #1: Continue to develop effective working relationships with the Pitt County Commissioners and establish an annual meeting date

Responsibility: Mayor, City Council, City Manager
Timeframe: October 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #2: Continue to work with the Town of Winterville and Greenville Utilities Commission through the joint committee to address mutual issues of growth and utility service

Responsibility: Councilmembers Dunn and Little, City Manager
Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #3: Develop a more mutually beneficial mutual aid agreement with one neighboring fire-rescue department

Responsibility: Fire-Rescue Department
Timeframe: September 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

B. *Objective: Continue partnership and form new partnerships with businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofits when opportunities exist*

Action Item #1: Continue to work with the Pitt County School Board on plans for improvements to Sadie Saulter School

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: July 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Meet with representatives of Pitt County School Board and Pitt Community College to determine a role for the City in providing technical skills for high school drop-outs

Responsibility: Mayor and City Manager
Timeframe: June 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #3: Continue to provide Community Development Block Grant and HOME funding to nonprofit agencies for implementation of the Consolidated Plan

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: June 2006
Fiscal Note: \$200,000

C. Objective: Create a database of nonprofit organizations

Action Item #1: Work with such agencies as the Greenville Foundation, Department of Revenue, Chamber of Commerce, and United Way to gather information on nonprofit organizations in Pitt County

Responsibility: City Clerk
Timeframe: September 30, 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs

Action Item #2: Have the database on nonprofit organizations in Pitt County put on the City of Greenville website

Responsibility: City Clerk
Timeframe: November 30, 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs

2. Goal: Organize City Services to Meet the Needs of the Citizens

A. Objective: One-stop shop for permits

Action Item #1: Prepare a list of permits issued by the City that require multiple stops

Responsibility: Public Works, Community Development, and Financial Services Departments
Timeframe: July 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs. Identification of permits performed in-house

Action Item #2: Prepare a report defining the impact of changes in multiple stop permitting; report to City Council

Responsibility: Public Works and Community Development Departments
Timeframe: December 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs. Study performed in-house.

Action Item #3: Develop implementation/transition plan for agreed-upon changes

Responsibility: City Manager
Timeframe: April 2007
Fiscal Note: No direct costs. Plan developed in-house

Action Item #4: Implement agreed-upon changes

Responsibility: City Manager

Timeframe: October 2007

Fiscal Note: Direct costs may be involved dependent on plan

B. *Objective: Have more communication with the public on issues going to the Planning and Zoning Commission*

Action Item #1: Promote more utilization of the City's web site where Planning and Zoning Commission agendas and meeting minutes are currently published approximately one week in advance of the upcoming meeting

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: No direct costs

Action Item # 2: Develop an e-mail listing of interested persons and organizations for distribution of the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda in advance of the scheduled meeting date

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: May 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct costs

Action Item #3: Facilitate the telecast of all Planning and Zoning Commission meetings on GTV-9

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: May 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost for facilitation. Action Item #1 under Goal 4, Objective C will address production costs.

C. *Objective: Reduce the per capita volume of solid waste being disposed of in landfills*

Action Item #1 Develop a plan to better promote the City's Recycling Program

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: September 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost – Plan of action to be completed in-house.

Action Item #2 Develop partnerships to increase recycling within the community

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: Begin immediately and complete by January 2007
Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #3: Develop incentive programs to inspire increased recycling

Responsibility: Public Works Department
Timeframe: March 2007
Fiscal Note: To be determined

D. *Objective: Enforce Ordinances that are in effect*

Action Item #1: Evaluate administration of nuisance, zoning, and minimum housing ordinances for their effectiveness and examine codes that need to be amended

Responsibility: Community Development Department, City Manager, and City Attorney
Timeframe: October 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs

3. Goal: Increase the Technological Capability of the City

A. *Objective: Increase use of information technology to provide direct service to citizens*

Action Item #1: Complete installation of InTouch citizen tracking software

Responsibility: Public Information Office and Information Technology
Timeframe: June 2006
Fiscal Note: \$20,000

Action Item #2: Further enhance the City's web page by working with users on prioritizing web topics, perform needs assessment for web-based software applications, select software applications and Click-to-Gov tools, and implement back-end software applications as needed
Responsibility: Information Technology Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: To be determined based on selected applications

B. *Objective: Consider technology enhancements in other departments*

Action Item #1: Evaluate a system for City Council agenda automation

Responsibility: City Manager, City Clerk, and Information Technology Department

Timeframe: May 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Assess the feasibility of allowing employees to be able to access their pay information from a personal computer. This enhancement would eliminate time and effort spent on printing direct deposit stubs and then stuffing them into envelopes.

Responsibility: Coordination between Financial Services,
Information Technology, and Human Resources
Departments

Timeframe: July 2007
Fiscal Note: To be determined

C. *Objective: Provide Citywide wireless Internet service*

Action Item #1: Determine any legal issues, license requirements, etc. associated with providing wireless service throughout the City.

Responsibility: City Attorney, Information Technology

Timeframe: May 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs.

Action Item #2: Develop a requirements document entailing the scope of the project and the desired results. Develop an RFP for wireless services.

Responsibility: Information Technology Department, Wireless
Consultant

Timeframe: August 2006
Fiscal Note: \$25,000 consulting service

Action Item #3: Send out Wireless RFP. Select a vendor for implementation of Wireless Service.

Responsibility: Information Technology Department, City
Manager, And Wireless Consultant

Timeframe: November 2006
Fiscal Note: \$5,000 consulting service

Action Item #4: Construct wireless system throughout the City.

Responsibility: Information Technology Department

Timeframe: May 2007
Fiscal Note: Estimated costs are \$2,659,949 infrastructure costs
with \$215,979 per year recurring costs

4. Goal: Develop Understanding and Broader Citizen Participation in City Government

A. *Objective: Continue implementation of Citizens Academy and Youth Council*

Action Item #1: Conduct the first Citizens Academy class

Responsibility: Public Information Officer
Timeframe: July 2006
Fiscal Note: \$2,500

Action Item #2: Continue to provide support for the Youth Council

Responsibility: Human Relations Council
Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: \$2,500

B. *Objective: Make decision on funding public access cable channel*

Action Item #1: Meet with Pitt County Manager and Public Information Officer to discuss shared funding

Responsibility: Public Information Officer
Timeframe: March 2006
Fiscal note: No direct cost

Action Item #2: Submit budget item to City Manager for approval during budget process.

Responsibility: Public Information Officer
Timeframe: February 2006
Fiscal note: \$ 33,000 (annually)

Action Item #3: Create agreement with Greenville Public Access Television for provisions of funding.

Responsibility: Public Information Officer, City Attorney
Timeframe: May 2006
Fiscal note: No direct cost

C. *Objective: Televis one additional board meeting (possibly Planning & Zoning Commission)*

Action Item #1: Study impact on staff and budget

Responsibility: Public Information Officer
Timeframe: June 2006
Fiscal note: To be determined

D. *Objective: Have a festival centered around Greenville's history*

Action Item #1: Working with the Historic Preservation Commission, Convention and Visitors Bureau, Chamber of Commerce, East Carolina University, Uptown Greenville, and relevant Pitt County businesses determine the feasibility of establishing a new history-themed festival or incorporating more historical references into an existing festival

Responsibility: City Council, City Manager, and Public Information Office

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

E. *Objective: Promote better Recreation and Parks marketing efforts*

Action Item #1: Consider creating a marketing and promotional position in the Recreation and Parks Department or contracting with a professional marketing firm

Responsibility: Recreation and Parks Department and City Council

Timeframe: June 2006

Fiscal Note: \$20,000 to \$94,000

Action Item #2: Consider increasing advertising budget for selected programs

Responsibility: Recreation and Parks Department and City Council

Timeframe: June 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

5. Goal: Enhance Diversity

A. *Objective: Continue efforts to make City government reflect the community we serve*

Action Item #1: Implement provisions of the City's revised Affirmative Action Statement

Responsibility: City Manager

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #2: Prepare annual reports as required by the Affirmative Action Statement

Responsibility: All Departments

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #3: Increase understanding of community diversity issues through the participation of all City supervisors in an updated diversity training workshop

Responsibility: Human Resources Department

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #4: Support the work of the Greenville Fire-Rescue employee recruitment team

Responsibility: Fire-Rescue Department

Timeframe: On-going

Fiscal Note: \$3,500

B. *Objective: Celebrate the diversity of our citizens*

Action Item #1: Review mission and goals and provide financial support for the Human Relations Council

Responsibility: Community Development Department, Human Relations Council, and City Council

Timeframe: August 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Increase participation in existing positive opportunities through public awareness, publicity, and targeted outreach efforts. Examples include, but are not limited to, the International Festival, Sunday in the Park, and July 4th Celebration.

Responsibility: Public Information Officer

Timeframe: On-going

Fiscal Note: Funds included in current budget

Action Item #3: Support ongoing efforts of senior assistance services

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: On-going

Fiscal Note: To be determined

6. Goal: Emphasize the Importance of Neighborhood Stabilization and Revitalization

A. *Objective: Preserve/prevent deterioration of single-family neighborhoods for more sustainable communities*

Action Item #1: Create a Rental Property Registration and Certification Program (See Task Force on Preservation of Neighborhoods and Housing [TFPNH] recommendation #1)

Responsibility: Community Development and Information
Technology Departments

Timeframe: January 2008

Fiscal Note: \$53,000.00

Action Item #2: Create a Code Enforcement Tracking System and Rental Property Database (See TFPNH recommendation #2)

Responsibility: Community Development and Information
Technology Departments

Timeframe: January 2007

Fiscal Note: \$58,000.00

Action Item #3: Revise the City's Code Enforcement and Appeals Process to promote consistency and capture the true cost of enforcement (See TFPNH recommendation #3)

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: November 2006

Fiscal Note: \$85,000.00

Action Item #4: Consider creating a Neighborhood Commission

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: January 2007

Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #5: Implement an enhanced collection effort for demolition, boarding up, and nuisance abatement expenses incurred by the City in its enforcement of the City Code including coordination with the County Legal Department on tax foreclosure actions.

Responsibility: City Attorney's Office

Timeframe: On-going

Fiscal Note: \$15,000

Action Item #6: Rezone remaining predominantly single-family use neighborhoods to an "S district" classification (See TFPNH recommendation #6)

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: \$4,500.00 in advertising costs

Action Item #7: Develop and adopt neighborhood plans to guide policy and investment decisions in older, established single-family neighborhoods (See TFPNH recommendation #9)

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: On-going
Fiscal Note: No direct costs

Action Item #8: Consider placing more electric lines underground in existing neighborhoods

Responsibility: City Manager and GUC
Timeframe: October 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #9: Transition to Community Oriented Code Enforcement

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: November 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #10: To address high utility bills, include energy efficiency as a key component in all City sponsored new construction and rehabilitation

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: To be determined for each home

B. *Objective: Set up pilot project in T.R.U.N.A. and all areas of City to increase homeownership*

Action Item #1: Create economic incentives to encourage reinvestment in established single-family neighborhoods (See TFPNH recommendation #7)

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: May 2006
Fiscal Note: \$30,000

Action Item #2: Develop and empower neighborhood associations, including financial assistance to train leaders and build organizational capacity (See TFPNH recommendation #8)

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: July 2006
Fiscal Note: \$71,000.00

C. *Objective: More new housing in the 45-Block Revitalization Area*

Action Item #1: Obtain buildable lots for construction of new housing units; construct 12 new houses for owner occupancy over the next two years

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: December 2008
Fiscal Note: \$660,000.00

D. *Objective: Stay focused on revitalization block-by-block (MLK Jr. Drive)*

Action Item #1: Continue to conduct activities on block-by-block basis, with bi-monthly updates to City Manager and City Council; focus on acquisition, demolition, new construction, and infrastructure improvements

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: \$1,500,000.00

E. *Objective: Expand loan program for conversion of rental property*

Action Item #1: Convert rental properties to owner-occupied housing; develop a Citywide down payment assistance program to assist 20 homebuyers over the next two years

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: December 2008
Fiscal Note: \$100,000.00

F. *Objective: Have open lines of communication with Greenville Housing Authority – monitoring Section 8 distribution*

Action Item #1: Hold quarterly staff meetings with Greenville Housing Authority to discuss mutual issues and goals related to redevelopment and housing

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: No direct cost

G. *Objective: Assisted living*

Action Item #1: Partner with developer(s) to develop and construct an assisted living center for elderly citizens in the 45-Block Revitalization Area

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: December 2008

Fiscal Note: Land acquisition and development costs to be determined

H. *Objective: Follow through on plans (i.e. Parks/Recreation Plan, neighborhood parks)*

Action Item #1: Amend the subdivision and zoning regulations to require recreation and open space reservations and/or dedications based on population impact

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: April 2006

Fiscal Note: None

Action Item #2: Update and amend the Parks Comprehensive Master Plan

Responsibility: Recreation and Parks Department

Timeframe: July 2007

Fiscal Note: \$30,000.00

Action Item #3: Prioritize the need and locations of neighborhood parks

Responsibility: Recreation and Parks Department

Timeframe: July 2007

Fiscal Note: None

I. *Objective: Develop a 20-30 year land plan*

Action Item #1: On an annual basis, conduct an internal review of the goals, objectives and implementation actions of the Horizons Comprehensive Plan

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: December 2006 and December 2007

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #2: Every five years, conduct an update of the Horizons Comprehensive Plan; amend goals, objectives, and implementation actions as necessary

Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Timeframe: Begin update process in 2007
 Fiscal Note: No direct cost

K. *Objective: Monitor bank compliance with the federal Community Reinvestment Act*

Action Item #1: Staff will schedule and coordinate at least one meeting per month with financial institutions to discuss Community Reinvestment Act initiatives and potential partnerships with city revitalization efforts

Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Timeframe: March 2007
 Fiscal Note: No direct cost

L. *Objective: Disposition of excess property*

Action Item #1: Dispose of any excess property in the 45-Block Revitalization Area

Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Fiscal Note: Minimal direct cost

Action Item #2: Develop a citywide program for identification and disposal of unused City properties for sale, with regular notices of availability

Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Fiscal Note: To be determined

7. Goal: Promote Economic Development in the City

A. *Objective: Support and advocate investment for a vibrant and prosperous Center City*

Action Item #1: Adopt and implement the *Center City – West Greenville Revitalization Plan* as the guiding framework plan for future City activities and investment

Responsibility: Redevelopment Commission, City Council, and Affordable Housing Loan Committee
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Fiscal Note: \$10 million initial City investment with bond funds

Action Item #2: Foster partnerships with East Carolina University and Uptown Greenville for expanded uptown developments

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #3: Explore acquiring former Park Theater for a community performing arts theater

Responsibility: City Manager
Timeframe: September 2006
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #4: Develop requirements for downtown wireless Internet service

Responsibility: Information Technology Department
Timeframe: June 2006
Fiscal Note: No direct costs

Action Item #5: Select vendor and implement wireless solution.

Responsibility: Information Technology Department
Timeframe: September 2006
Fiscal Note: \$85,000 cost of hardware and installation services.

B. *Objective: Create more downtown residential housing with historic architecture for all income levels*

Action Item #1: In accordance with the Center City and West Greenville Revitalization Plans, staff will develop conceptual plans for housing in the 1st Street/Town Commons area and in the Historic Warehouse District

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: June 2006
Fiscal Note: Minimal direct costs

Action Item #2: Staff will contact private sector financial and development partners to structure development agreements that will move the housing plans from concept to reality

Responsibility: Community Development Department
Timeframe: June 2007
Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #3: Working with Uptown Greenville, staff will develop site design guidelines that will ensure new construction and substantial renovations in the Center City conform to the historic and aesthetic character of the area

Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Timeframe: June 2007
 Fiscal Note: Minimal direct costs

C. *Objective: Promote opportunities for small and minority businesses, and encourage utilization of the minority workforce*

Action Item #1: Revise/update City's current MWBE program to increase and enhance outreach to small businesses

Responsibility: Financial Services Department
 Timeframe: December 2006
 Fiscal Note: \$40,082

Action Item #2: Implement process for analyzing the City's use of minority contractors to determine whether the stated goals of the MWBE program are being met. Prepare monthly/quarterly/yearly reports on the utilization of MWBE firms by the City of Greenville and Greenville Utilities Commission

Responsibility: Financial Services Department
 Timeframe: December 2006
 Fiscal Note: \$40,082

D. *Objective: Retain businesses in the redevelopment areas*

Action Item #1: Evaluate the establishment of a small business incubator similar to the one recently built in Raleigh.

Responsibility: Financial Services and Community Development
 Departments
 Timeframe: October 2007
 Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Contact all businesses within the West Greenville Redevelopment Area that are considering relocation to offer assistance to relocate within the Redevelopment Area

Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Timeframe: July 2006 and then ongoing
 Fiscal Note: To be determined

E. *Objective: Encourage small business development*

Action Item #1: Sponsor HUB Academy in partnership with East Carolina University and Carolinas Associated General Contractors

Responsibility: Financial Services Department
 Timeframe: June 2006
 Fiscal Note: \$2,000

Action Item #2: Research and evaluate the possibility of implementing a mentor program for small businesses. This program would partner small contractors with a large firm doing business in the same industry to assist the small business in being successful in a very competitive environment

Responsibility: Financial Services Department
 Timeframe: September 2006
 Fiscal Note: To be determined

F.Objective: Promote the City to retain and expand business/industry and provide quality jobs

Action Item #1: Continue to work closely with Pitt County Development Commission, Chamber of Commerce, East Carolina University, Pitt Community College, University Health Systems, and others to retain and expand business and industry and to encourage job creation with full benefits

Responsibility: City Manager
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Fiscal Note: To be determined as needed

8. Goal: Provide a Safe Community

A. Objective: Create and implement community policing policies that increase public contact and improve the perception of the Police Department

Action Item #1: Allocate resources to best provide community policing based on calls for service analysis completed in 2005

Responsibility: Police Department
 Timeframe: December 2006
 Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Increase use of activity data to hold officers and supervisors accountable to assigned communities

Responsibility: Police Department
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Fiscal Note: Cost of upgraded computer system is \$1,200,000

Action Item #3: Increase public contact by the command staff of the Police Department by attendance at more community organization meetings

Responsibility: Chief of Police

Timeframe: On-going

Fiscal Note: No cost

Action Item #4: Provide support for expanded community policing efforts

Responsibility: City Council and City Manager

Timeframe: On-going

Fiscal Note: To be determined

B. *Objective: Become more active in the prevention of juvenile violence in the community*

Action Item #1: Implement after school program to target at risk youth

Responsibility: Police Department

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Partner with Pitt County and other municipal law enforcement agencies to target gang activity

Responsibility: Police Department

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined (Federal funding request made)

Action Item #3: Partner with Citizens United Against Violence to address youth violence issues

Responsibility: Police Department

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined (Grant applications pending)

C. *Objective: Strengthen crime prevention efforts by increasing participation in community watch programs*

Action Item #1: Coordinate district officer participation with community watch programs

Responsibility: Police Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: Some overtime cost to be determined

Action Item #2: Develop and implement new crime prevention programs with existing partners (community watch and other community organizations) and pursue new partnerships with faith based organizations

Responsibility: Police Department

Timeframe: March 2007

Fiscal Note: Minimal direct cost

D. *Objective: Improve the efficiency of public safety resources by addressing the Police response to false alarms*

Action Item #1: Study the current ordinance and current practices of other municipalities.

Responsibility: Police Department

Timeframe: July 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #2: Formulate implementation plan to be presented to Council

Responsibility: Police Department and City Attorney

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

E. *Objective: Strengthen preparedness for a major disaster*

Action Item #1: Partner with the Pitt County Red Cross to jointly provide training to the business community on emergency management and business survival from disasters

Responsibility: Fire-Rescue Department

Timeframe: September 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

Action Item #2: Rewrite the City's Emergency Management Operations Guidelines

Responsibility: Fire-Rescue Department

Timeframe: July 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

9. Goal: Develop Transportation Initiatives to Meet Community Growth and Ensure a Sustainable Community

A. *Objective: Improve roads leading into and out of the City*

Action Item #1: Continue the inventory of conditions for all State and City-maintained roadways within the City

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: Direct cost estimated at \$75,000 for ITRE Street Condition Inventory Update

Action Item #2: Prioritize for improvement/repair based on condition survey

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct costs. Priority established in-house based on condition survey

Action Item #3: Develop schedule for repair of City-maintained streets (resurfacing program)

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost. Schedule prepared in-house

Action Item #4: Meet with NCDOT to develop schedule for repair of State highways

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct costs. Meeting and negotiations with NCDOT performed in-house

Action Item #5: Work with Greenville Urban Area MPO and NCDOT to promote construction of new roads

Responsibility: Mayor, City Manager, and Public Works Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: Will be direct reimbursable for some of these activities as part of the MPO Grant; otherwise, no direct cost.

B. Objective: Develop initiatives/programs to reduce urban congestion

Action Item #1: Conduct Congestion Management Study for the Greenville Boulevard/ Memorial Drive Corridor

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: April 2006

Fiscal Note: Estimated cost of study \$70,000 with \$56,000 reimbursable through MPO Grant.

Action Item #2: Meet with largest employers to discuss feasibility of staggered starts, and park and ride programs

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: June 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost. Contact and discussions performed by in-house personnel

Action Item #3: Continue to participate in Public Transportation Working Group

Responsibility: City Manager and Public Works Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: No direct cost. Staff works with Pitt County, ECU, and PATS

C. *Objective: Promote/lobby for state and federal funding for local transportation improvements*

Action Item #1: Continue to work through the Greenville Urban Area MPO to publicize and lobby for the most important transportation needs

Responsibility: Mayor, City Manager, and Public Works Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: No direct costs anticipated; 80% of incurred costs reimbursable through the MPO

Action Item #2: Work with NCDOT Board members and local legislative delegation to promote the most important transportation needs

Responsibility: Mayor and Council, City Manager, and Public Works Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Fiscal Note: No direct costs anticipated; 80% of incurred costs reimbursable through the MPO

Action Item #3: Work with NCDOT and CSX to relocate rail switching yard

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

D. *Objective: Increase ridership on Greenville Area Transit (GREAT)*

Action Item #1: Develop marketing program to better promote Greenville Area Transit (GREAT)

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: Immediate

Fiscal Note: Costs will be absorbed in this year's budget and included as part of the FY 06-07 budget

Action Item #2: Increase distribution of information/route schedules for GREAT

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: July 2006

Fiscal Note: Cost associated with this Action Item is included in 06-07 budget

Action Item #3: Develop partnerships with other agencies to facilitate the use of GREAT

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: December 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost associated – Will be completed in-house

D. *Objective: Improve and make safer pedestrian crossings throughout Greenville*

Action Item #1: Evaluate crosswalks at all existing signalized intersections

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: July 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost. Evaluations will be performed with existing staff

Action Item #2: Replace worn out crosswalk markings with thermoplastic pavement markings

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: Complete by December 2006

Fiscal Note: Direct costs of materials and labor are included in current operating budget and for the FY 2006-2007 budget

Action Item #3: Develop program to replace existing pedestrian signal heads with countdown pedestrian signals

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: Program will be developed by July 2006.

Implementation of program will be ongoing.

Fiscal Note: Program is subject to receiving funds for signal equipment.

Action Item #4: Include countdown pedestrian signal heads at new signal installations where sidewalks exist

Responsibility: Public Works Department

Timeframe: Ongoing as signalization projects develop

Fiscal Note: Costs of countdown pedestrian signal heads will be included as part of an overall project for a new traffic signal installation at an intersection with sidewalks.

10. Goal: Maintain the Financial Stability of the City

A. *Objective: Improve the format of financial information decision-making*

Action Item #1: Re-format the budget to a two-year budget and establish a fleet management fund

Responsibility: Financial Services Department and City Manager

Timeframe: June 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined by budget process

Action Item #2: Adopt revised investment policy to better manage City funds

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: March 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

B. *Objective: Determine plans for moving forward on annexations*

Action Item #1: Develop an Annexation Policy and Implementation Plan for City Council consideration

Responsibility: City Manager and Community Development Department

Timeframe: September 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #2: Adopt an Annexation Policy and Implementation Plan

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: October 2006

Fiscal Note: No direct cost

Action Item #3: Initiate annexation process for River Hills Subdivision

Responsibility: City Manager and Community Development Department

Timeframe: July 2006

Fiscal Note: To be determined

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to adopt the City of Greenville 2006-2007 Goals. Motion carried unanimously.

REPORT ON BIDS AWARDED

City Manager Wayne Bowers referred the Council to bids that had been awarded as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
12/21/2005	City Pool Renovations	Miracle Pools, Inc.	\$108,927.00
12/21/2005	Reade Street Streetscape	Reynolds and Jewell, PA	29,300.00
2/14/2006	One each 25 CY Rear Load Refuse Truck and one each Knuckle Boom Truck	Flow Chevrolet, LLC	194,041.00
2/22/2006	Install and Furnish Playground Equipment	Miracle Recreation Equipment	50,959.00

COMMENTS FROM MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Little requested an update on the renegotiations with Cox Communications.

Council Member Little suggested that on new ordinances, there should be two readings. He suggested having the first reading and a public hearing to receive comments from the public at one meeting and then adoption of the ordinance the following month.

Council Member Dunn stated that she would hate to see the Council establish that policy.

Mayor Pro-Tem Council thanked the citizens for coming out today to express what they consider justice. The City needs to respond in some way to what they heard tonight.

Council Member Dunn wished everyone a happy Saint Patrick's Day.

Council Member Glover thanked the City Manager for the revitalization process. She stated that she admired the way he does things.

Council Member Glover stated that there will be another forum regarding Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive at 7:00 p.m. on March 27 at the Eppes Center.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Upon being informed that there is no business that needs to be conducted on March 20, motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to cancel the March 20 City Council meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

City Manager Bowers informed the Council that the retirement celebration for Chief of Police Joe Simonowich will be held at the City Hotel and Bistro at 6:30 on March 15.

CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Council Member Little to go into closed session to establish or to instruct the public body's staff or negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken by or on behalf of the public body in negotiating the price and other material terms of a contract or proposed contract for the acquisition of terms of a contract or proposed contract for the acquisition of real property by purchase, option, exchange, or lease. Motion carried unanimously.

OPEN SESSION

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Glover to return to open session. Motion carried unanimously.

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY ON MOYE BOULEVARD NEAR GUY SMITH STADIUM - CONTINUED

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to continue the agenda item relating to the purchase of the 1.086-acre parcel on Moye Boulevard near Guy Smith Stadium from Utmost, LLC. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURN

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Little to adjourn the meeting at 11:05 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Wanda T. Elks, MMC
City Clerk